

# LONG-TIME ASYMPTOTIC SOLUTIONS OF CONVEX HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS WITH NEUMANN TYPE BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

HITOSHI ISHII

ABSTRACT. We study the long-time asymptotic behavior of solutions  $u$  of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation  $u_t(x, t) + H(x, Du(x, t)) = 0$  in  $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$ , where  $\Omega$  is a bounded open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with Hamiltonian  $H = H(x, p)$  being convex and coercive in  $p$ , and establish the uniform convergence of  $u$  to an asymptotic solution as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We study the long-time behavior of solutions of the initial-boundary (value) problem for the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$(1.1) \quad u_t(x, t) + H(x, Du(x, t)) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, \infty),$$

where  $u = u(x, t)$  represents the unknown function on  $\bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)$ ,  $\Omega$  is a bounded domain (i.e., open connected subset) of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $u_t := \partial u / \partial t$ ,  $Du := (\partial u / \partial x_1, \dots, \partial u / \partial x_n)$  and  $H = H(x, p)$  is the so-called Hamiltonian, which is a given continuous function on  $\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^n$  assumed to be convex in  $p$ . We are concerned with the Neumann type boundary condition

$$(1.2) \quad D_\gamma u(x, t) = g(x) \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty),$$

where  $g$  is a given continuous function on  $\partial\Omega$ ,  $D_\gamma u(x, t)$  denotes the derivative of  $u$  in the direction of the vector  $\gamma(x)$ , i.e.,  $D_\gamma u(x, t) := \gamma(x) \cdot Du(x, t)$ , and  $\gamma$  is a given continuous vector field on  $\partial\Omega$  oblique to  $\partial\Omega$ . The initial condition is given by a continuous function  $u_0$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . That is,

$$(1.3) \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

In addition to the continuity of  $H$ ,  $g$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $u_0$  and the boundedness of  $\Omega$ , we make the following assumptions.

- (A1)  $H$  is a convex Hamiltonian, i.e., for each  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$  the function  $H(x, \cdot)$  is convex on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .
- (A2)  $H$  is coercive. That is,  $\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} H(x, p) = \infty$  for all  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ .
- (A3)  $\Omega$  is a  $C^1$  domain.
- (A4)  $\gamma$  is oblique to  $\partial\Omega$ . That is, for any  $x \in \partial\Omega$ , if  $\nu(x)$  denotes the outer unit normal vector at  $x$ , then  $\nu(x) \cdot \gamma(x) > 0$ .

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 35B40; Secondary 35F31, 35D40, 37J50, 49L25.

*Key words and phrases*. Asymptotic solutions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations, Neumann condition, Aubry sets, weak KAM theory.

The author was supported in part by KAKENHI #20340026, #20340019 and #21224001, JSPS.

According to [15, Theorem 5.1] (see also [18, Theorem 12]), we have the following existence and uniqueness theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Under the above assumptions, there exists a unique solution  $u \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty))$  of (1.1)–(1.3).*

The stationary problem associated with (1.1)–(1.3) is the so-called ergodic problem or additive eigenvalue problem, that is, the problem of finding a pair of a constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and a function  $w \in C(\bar{\Omega})$  such that  $w$  is a solution of

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} H(x, Dw(x)) = c & \text{in } \Omega, \\ D_\gamma w(x) = g(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Existence results for the ergodic problem (1.4) go back to [18, Section VII]. According to [15, Theorem 6.1] or [18, Theorem 14], we have

**Proposition 1.2.** *There exists a unique constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  such that (1.4) has a solution  $w \in \text{Lip}(\bar{\Omega})$ .*

The unique constant  $c$  given by the above proposition is called the *critical value* and is given as the minimum value of  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  for which problem (1.4), with  $c$  replaced by  $a$ , has a subsolution. A general useful remark here is this: under condition (A2), every subsolution  $w$  of (1.4), with any given constant  $c$ , is Lipschitz continuous on  $\bar{\Omega}$ .

In the above two propositions, assumption (A1) is superfluous to obtain the stated conclusions, and we do not seek for optimal hypotheses for such conclusions. In fact, this work is a continuation of [15], where the author [15] has studied (1.4) as well as (1.1)–(1.3) in the view point of weak KAM theory under assumptions (A1)–(A4).

The notion of solution of (1.1) and (1.2) or (1.4) adopted here is that of viscosity solution and we refer the reader to [3, 1, 7] for a general account of viscosity solutions theory.

We set

$$Q = \{(x, p) \in \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^n : H(x, p) = c\},$$

$$S = \{(x, \xi) \in \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \text{there exists } p \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ such that } (x, p) \in Q \text{ and } \xi \in D_2^+ H(x, p)\},$$

where  $c$  is the critical value.

We now introduce another assumption on  $H$  and we assume in our main theorem that either of the following (A5)<sub>+</sub> or (A5)<sub>−</sub> holds:

**(A5)<sub>±</sub>** There exists a modulus  $\omega$  satisfying  $\omega(r) > 0$  for  $r > 0$  such that if  $(x, p) \in Q$ ,  $\xi \in D_2^+ H(x, p)$  and  $p' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then

$$H(x, p + p') \geq \xi \cdot (p + p') + \omega((\xi \cdot p')_\pm).$$

In the above and in what follows, the term “modulus” is used to indicate a continuous, nondecreasing function  $\omega$  on  $[0, \infty)$  such that  $\omega(0) = 0$ , and we use the notation:  $r_+ = \max\{r, 0\}$  and  $r_- = \min\{r, 0\}$  for  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ .

We are now in position to state our main result.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Under the above hypotheses, there exists a solution  $w \in \text{Lip}(\bar{\Omega})$  of (1.4) such that  $u(x, t) + ct$  converges to  $w(x)$  uniformly for  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .*

The above theorem states that the solution  $u(x, t)$  of (1.1)–(1.3) “converges” to an “asymptotic solution”  $w(x) - ct$  of (1.1), (1.2) uniformly on  $\bar{\Omega}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

The study of the long-time asymptotic behavior of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations (1.1) has a long history, which goes back to [16, 17, 2], and it has received an intense interest in recent years. For some recent developments, we refer to [9, 21, 6, 22, 8, 10, 14, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20]. These literatures have established results similar to the above theorem in the case when  $\Omega$  is a compact manifold without boundary, typically an  $n$ -dimensional flat torus ([9, 21, 6, 22, 8]), or in the case when  $\Omega$  is the whole  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space under an appropriate behavior of solutions at infinity ([5, 10, 14, 11, 12, 13]), or in the case of the state-constraints or the Dirichlet boundary conditions ([22, 19, 20]). Concerning the Neumann boundary conditions, Theorem 1.3 is one of first, general results on the convergence of solutions of (1.1), (1.2) to asymptotic solutions. In this regard, the author recently learned that G. Barles and H. Mitake ([4]) had obtained convergence results similar to the above theorem. They took a PDE approach similar to the one in [6], which is fairly different from ours. They do not assume the convexity of  $H$  although our convergence result under (A5)– seems to be out of their scope.

Henceforth, by replacing  $H$  by  $H - c$  if necessary, we normalize that  $c = 0$ . Thus, the problem

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} H(x, Dw(x)) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ D_\gamma w(x) = g(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

has a solution. The conclusion of Theorem 1.3 is now stated as the uniform convergence on  $\bar{\Omega}$  of the solution  $u(x, t)$  of (1.1)–(1.3) to a solution  $w(x)$  of (1.5) as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

In the next section we establishes a theorem which adapts [14, Proposition 2.4] to accommodate the Neumann type boundary condition. In Section 3, we prove our main result, Theorem 1.3. In Section 4, we give formulas for asymptotic solutions similar to [8, 10, 14, 11, 13, 19, 20], which are now standard observations.

## 2. AN EXISTENCE RESULT

We write  $B_r$  for the open ball  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| < r\}$ , with  $r > 0$ , and  $e_n$  for the unit vector  $(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $I = [0, T]$ , with  $0 < T < \infty$ .

In this section we will be devoted to proving the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$  be a subsolution of (1.5). Let  $\eta \in AC(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$  be such that  $\eta(t) \in \bar{\Omega}$  for  $t \in I$ . Set  $I_\partial = \{t \in I : \eta(t) \in \partial\Omega\}$ . Then there exists a function  $p \in L^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$  such that*

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{d}{dt} u \circ \eta(t) = p(t) \cdot \dot{\eta}(t) \quad \text{a.e. } t \in I,$$

$$(2.2) \quad H(\eta(t), p(t)) \leq 0 \quad \text{a.e. } t \in I,$$

$$(2.3) \quad \gamma(\eta(t)) \cdot p(t) \leq g(\eta(t)) \quad \text{a.e. } t \in I_\partial.$$

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $U$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\phi \in \text{Lip}(U)$  and  $\eta \in \text{AC}(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$ . Assume that  $\eta(t) \in U$  for all  $t \in I$ . Then there exists a function  $q \in L^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} q(t) &\in \partial_{\text{Cu}}(\eta(t)) \quad \text{a.e. } t \in I, \\ \frac{d}{dt}u \circ \eta(t) &= q(t) \cdot \dot{\eta}(t) \quad \text{a.e. } t \in I. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\partial_{\text{Cu}}(x)$  stands for the Clarke differential of  $u$  at  $x$ , which is defined as

$$\partial_{\text{Cu}}(x) = \bigcap_{r>0} Du(x; r),$$

where  $Du(x; r)$  denotes the closed convex hull of

$$\{Du(y) : y \in \mathbb{R}^n, |y - x| < r, u \text{ is differentiable at } y\}.$$

In what follows, given a vector  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we denote by the symbol  $w^*$  the function given by  $x \mapsto w \cdot x$ . Typically we write  $\{e_n^* \leq 0\}$  for the set  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : e_n \cdot x \leq 0\}$ . Let  $\phi$  be a function defined on a subset  $V$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For  $x \in V$ , we denote by  $D_V^+ \phi(x)$  the superdifferential of  $\phi$  at  $x$ , i.e., the set of points  $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$\phi(y) \leq \phi(x) + p \cdot (y - x) + o(|y - x|) \quad \text{as } y \in V \text{ and } y \rightarrow x.$$

When  $V$  is a neighborhood of  $x$ , we write just  $D^+ \phi(x)$  for  $D_V^+ \phi(x)$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $r > 0$  and  $v \in \text{Lip}(B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\})$ . Let  $L > 0$  be a Lipschitz constant of  $v$ . Let  $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and assume that  $\gamma_i \cdot e_n \geq 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2| \leq \varepsilon/L$ . Let  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and assume that*

$$\min\{|q| - L, \gamma_1 \cdot q - a\} \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } q \in D_{B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}}^+ v(0).$$

Let  $p \in D_{B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}}^+ v(0)$  be such that  $\gamma_1 \cdot p \leq a$ . Then we have  $\gamma_2 \cdot p \leq a + \varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* We set  $P = D_{B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}}^+ v(0)$  and note that

$$(2.4) \quad \min\{|q| - L, \gamma_1 \cdot q - a\} \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } q \in \bar{P}.$$

Note as well that  $P$  and  $\bar{P}$  are convex.

We may assume that  $v$  is defined and Lipschitz continuous on  $\bar{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$ . Fix any  $p \in D_{B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}}^+ v(0)$ , and choose a function  $\phi \in C^1(\bar{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\})$  such that  $D\phi(0) = p$  and that  $v - \phi$  attains a strict maximum at the origin. We may assume by adding a constant to  $\phi$  that  $(v - \phi)(0) = 0$ .

For any  $0 < \delta \leq r$ , we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_\delta &= \{t \in \mathbb{R} : \max_{\bar{B}_\delta \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}} (v - \phi - te_n^*) > 0\}, \\ t_\delta &= \inf \Theta_\delta. \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that  $(L + |p|, \infty) \subset \Theta_\delta \subset (0, \infty)$  and that if  $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2 \leq r$ , then  $\Theta_{\delta_1} \subset \Theta_{\delta_2}$ . Therefore, if  $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2 \leq r$ , then  $L + |p| \geq t_{\delta_1} \geq t_{\delta_2} \geq 0$ . We set

$$t_0 = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0+} t_\delta,$$

and observe that

$$t_0 = \sup_{\delta > 0} t_\delta \in [0, L + |p|].$$

We note that if  $\mu > 0$ , then

$$(2.5) \quad \max_{\overline{B}_\delta \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}} (v - \phi - (t_0 + \mu)e_n^*) > 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < \delta \leq r.$$

Fix any  $\mu > 0$ , and for  $\beta > 0$  we set

$$\Phi_\beta(x) = v(x) - \phi(x) - (t_0 + 2\mu)e_n \cdot x - \beta(e_n \cdot x)^2 \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}.$$

Let  $x_\beta \in \overline{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$  be a maximum point of  $\Phi_\beta$ . Since  $\Phi_\beta(x_\beta) \geq \Phi_\beta(0) = 0$ , we have

$$\beta(e_n \cdot x_\beta)^2 \leq v(x_\beta) - \phi(x_\beta) - (t_0 + 2\mu)e_n \cdot x_\beta$$

from which we see that  $x_\beta \cdot e_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, we deduce that

$$\liminf_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} (v - \phi)(x_\beta) \geq 0,$$

from which we conclude that  $x_\beta \rightarrow 0$  as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ .

Observe that if  $-\mu/\beta < e_n \cdot x < 0$ , then

$$-\mu e_n \cdot x - \beta(e_n \cdot x)^2 = |e_n \cdot x|(\mu - \beta|e_n \cdot x|) > 0.$$

From this and (2.5) we see that  $\Phi_\beta(x_\beta) = \max_{\overline{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}} \Phi_\beta > 0$ . In particular, we have  $e_n \cdot x_\beta > 0$ . Thus, by choosing  $\beta > 0$  large enough, we may assume that  $x_\beta \in B_r \cap \{e_n^* < 0\}$ , and consequently we have

$$0 \in D^+ \Phi_\beta(x_\beta) = D^+ v(x_\beta) - D\phi(x_\beta) - (t_0 + 2\mu)e_n - 2\beta(e_n \cdot x_\beta)e_n.$$

Thus, if  $\beta$  is large enough, then we have

$$(2.6) \quad |D\phi(x_\beta) + (t_0 + 2\mu)e_n + 2\beta(e_n \cdot x_\beta)e_n| \leq L.$$

Next, note that there is a constant  $\rho = \rho_\mu \in (0, r)$  such that  $t_0 - \mu \leq t_\rho$ , that is,

$$(2.7) \quad \max_{\overline{B}_\rho \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}} (v - \phi - (t_0 - \mu)e_n^*) = 0.$$

By choosing  $\beta$  large enough, we may assume that  $x_\beta \in B_\rho$ . Then we have

$$v(x_\beta) - \phi(x_\beta) - (t_0 - \mu)e_n \cdot x_\beta \leq 0 < \Phi_\beta(x_\beta),$$

and therefore

$$\beta(e_n \cdot x_\beta)^2 < -3\mu e_n \cdot x_\beta = 3\mu|e_n \cdot x_\beta|,$$

which yields

$$(2.8) \quad \beta|e_n \cdot x_\beta| < 3\mu.$$

Due to (2.7), the function  $\Psi := v - \phi - (t_0 - \mu)e_n^*$  attains a maximum at the origin over  $B_\rho \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$ , and hence we have

$$0 \in D_{B_\rho \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}}^+ \Psi(0) = P - D\phi(0) - (t_0 - \mu)e_n.$$

That is, we have

$$(2.9) \quad p + (t_0 - \mu)e_n \in P.$$

Sending  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$  first and then  $\mu \rightarrow 0$  and using (2.8), we obtain from (2.6)

$$|p + t_0 e_n| \leq L.$$

Also, from (2.9) we see that

$$p + t_0 e_n \in \overline{P}.$$

We set  $A = \{t \in [0, t_0] : |p + te_n| \leq L\}$  and  $B = \{t \in [0, t_0] : \gamma_1 \cdot (p + te_n) \leq a\}$ . By the convexity of  $\bar{P}$ , since  $p, p + t_0 e_n \in \bar{P}$ , we see that  $p + te_n \in \bar{P}$  for  $t \in [0, t_0]$ . In view of (2.4), we have  $[0, t_0] = A \cup B$ . Since  $A$  and  $B$  is closed sets, setting  $\tau = \min B$ , we have  $\tau \in A \cap B$ . Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_2 \cdot p &\leq \gamma_2 \cdot (p + \tau e_n) \leq \gamma_1 \cdot (p + \tau e_n) + |\gamma_2 - \gamma_1| |p + \tau e_n| \\ &\leq a + L|\gamma_2 - \gamma_1| \leq a + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\gamma \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  satisfy*

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} e_n \cdot \gamma(x) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (|\gamma(x)| + |g(x)|) < \infty.$$

*Then there exists a function  $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that*

$$\gamma(x) \cdot D\psi(x) = g(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

The above assertion is well-known, but for completeness we give a proof.

*Proof.* The idea is to solve the initial value problem for the linear PDE

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{cases} \gamma(x) \cdot D\psi(x) = g(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \psi(x) = 0 & \text{if } e_n \cdot x = 0. \end{cases}$$

For  $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$  let  $\Phi(x, t)$  denote the (unique) solution of the initial value problem for ODE

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_t(x, t) = \gamma(\Phi(x, t)) & \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \Phi(x, 0) = x, \end{cases}$$

where  $\Phi_t := \partial\Phi/\partial t$ . By the standard ODE theory we see that  $\Phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ . Moreover, since

$$0 < \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} e_n \cdot \gamma \leq e_n \cdot \gamma(\Phi(x, t)) = e_n \cdot \Phi_t(x, t) \leq \sup_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\gamma| < \infty,$$

we see that for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , there exists a unique  $\tau(x) \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $e_n \cdot \Phi(x, \tau(x)) = 0$ . Then the implicit function theorem guarantees that  $\tau \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

We define  $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  by setting

$$\psi(x) = - \int_0^{\tau(x)} g(\Phi(x, t)) dt.$$

It is obvious that  $\psi(x) = 0$  if  $e_n \cdot x = 0$ . For  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &= - \int_0^r g(\Phi(x, t)) dt - \int_r^{\tau(x)} g(\Phi(x, t)) dt \\ &= - \int_0^r g(\Phi(x, t)) dt - \int_0^{\tau(x)-r} g(\Phi(\Phi(x, r), t)) dt \\ &= - \int_0^r g(\Phi(x, t)) dt + \psi(\Phi(x, r)). \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating the above by  $r$  and setting  $r = 0$ , we get

$$0 = -g(x) + \gamma(x) \cdot D\psi(x).$$

Thus the function  $\psi$  is a solution of (2.10), which completes the proof.  $\square$

In the next lemma, we assume that the vector field  $\gamma$  is of class  $C^1$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $r > 0$ ,  $G \in C(\overline{B}_r \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\gamma \in C^1(\overline{B}_r, \mathbb{R}^n)$ . Assume that  $G$  satisfies (A2), with  $\Omega$  replaced by  $B_r$ , and that  $e_n \cdot \gamma(x) > 0$  for all  $x \in \overline{B}_r$ . Let  $v \in C(\overline{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\})$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and assume that  $v$  is a subsolution of*

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{cases} G(x, Dv) = 0 & \text{in } B_r \cap \{e_n^* < 0\}, \\ D_\gamma v(x) = -\varepsilon & \text{on } B_r \cap \{e_n^* = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists a function  $w \in \text{Lip}(B_{r/2} \cap \{e_n^* < \delta\})$ , with  $\delta > 0$ , such that

$$|v(x) - w(x)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } x \in B_{r/2} \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\},$$

and  $\phi$  is both a subsolution of

$$G(x, Dw(x)) = \varepsilon \quad \text{in } B_{r/2} \cap \{e_n^* < \delta\}$$

and of

$$\gamma(x) \cdot Dw(x) = \varepsilon \quad \text{in } B_{r/2} \cap \{|e_n^*| < \delta\}.$$

We remark that, by definition,  $v$  is a subsolution of (2.11) if and only if

$$\begin{cases} G(x, p) \leq 0 & \text{for } p \in D^+v(x) \text{ and } x \in B_r \cap \{e_n^* < 0\}, \\ G(x, p) \wedge (\gamma(x) \cdot p + \varepsilon) \leq 0 & \text{for } p \in D_{B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}}^+v(x) \text{ and } x \in B_r \cap \{e_n^* = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

In order to prove the above lemma we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.6.** *There exists a function  $\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ , where  $\mathbb{R}_+^n := \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times (0, \infty) = \{e_n^* > 0\}$ , such that*

$$\begin{cases} \zeta(\xi, tz) = t^2 \zeta(\xi, z) & \text{for } (\xi, z, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \zeta(\xi, z) > 0 & \text{for } (\xi, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}), \\ \xi \cdot D_z \zeta(\xi, z) = (e_n \cdot \xi)(e_n \cdot z) & \text{for } (\xi, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

We refer the reader to [15, Lemma 2.3] for a proof of the above lemma. For the proof of Lemma 2.5, we follow that of [15, Lemma 2.5].

*Proof of Lemma 2.5.* In view of (A2) we may choose a constant  $L > 0$  so that

$$\{G(x, \cdot) \leq 0\} \subset \overline{B}_L \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{B}_r.$$

It is easily seen that  $v$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\overline{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$ , with  $L$  as its Lipschitz constant. Let  $\omega_G$  be the modulus of continuity of the function  $G$  on  $B_r \times B_L$ .

Let  $\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$  be the function given by Lemma 2.6. We note by the homogeneity of the functions  $\zeta(\xi, \cdot)$  that

$$C_0^{-1}|z|^2 \leq \zeta(\xi, z) \leq C_0|z|^2, \quad |D_\xi \zeta(\xi, z)| \leq C_0|z|^2, \quad |D_z \zeta(\xi, z)| \leq C_0|z|$$

for all  $(\xi, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  and for some constant  $1 < C_0 < \infty$ . We set  $\psi(x, y) = \zeta(\gamma(x), x - y)$  and note that

$$\begin{aligned} D_x \psi(x, y) &= (D\gamma(x))^T D_\xi \zeta(\gamma(x), x - y) + D_z \zeta(\gamma(x), x - y), \\ D_y \psi(x, y) &= -D_z \zeta(\gamma(x), x - y), \end{aligned}$$

where  $A^T$  denotes the transposed matrix of the matrix  $A$ . From these we get

$$(2.12) \quad |D_x\psi(x, y) + D_y\psi(x, y)| = |(D\gamma(x))^T D_\xi\zeta(\gamma(x), x - y)| \leq C_0 C_1 |x - y|^2,$$

where  $C_1 > 0$  is a bound of  $|D\gamma(x)|$  over  $x \in \bar{B}_r$ .

For  $0 < \delta < 1$  we define the sup-convolution  $v^\delta \in C(\bar{B}_r)$  by

$$v^\delta(x) = \max_{y \in \bar{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}} \left( v(y) - \frac{1}{\delta} \psi(x, y) \right).$$

It is well-known and easy to see that  $v^\delta(x) \rightarrow v(x)$  uniformly on  $\bar{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  and that  $v^\delta$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\bar{B}_r$ .

Henceforth we fix any  $x \in B_{r/2} \cap \{e_n^* < \delta^2\}$ , and choose a maximizer  $y \in \bar{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$  of the above formula, so that we have

$$v^\delta(x) = v(y) - \frac{1}{\delta} \psi(x, y).$$

We collect here some estimates based on this choice of  $x, y$ . Let  $\hat{x}$  denote the projection of  $x$  onto the half space  $\{e_n^* \leq 0\}$ . That is,  $\hat{x} = x - (e_n \cdot x)e_n$  if  $e_n \cdot x > 0$  and  $\hat{x} = x$  otherwise. Noting that  $\hat{x} \in B_{r/2} \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$  and  $|x - \hat{x}| < \delta$ , we get

$$v^\delta(x) \geq v(\hat{x}) - \frac{1}{\delta} \psi(x, \hat{x}),$$

and moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\delta} \psi(x, y) &= v(y) - v^\delta(x) \leq v(y) - v(\hat{x}) + \frac{1}{\delta} \psi(x, \hat{x}) \\ &\leq L|y - \hat{x}| + \frac{C_0 |\hat{x} - y|^2}{\delta} \leq L|x - y| + (L + C_0)\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\psi(x, y) \geq C_0^{-1}|x - y|^2$ , we get

$$|x - y|^2 \leq C_0 L \delta |x - y| + C_0 (L + C_0) \delta^2,$$

from which we deduce that

$$(2.13) \quad |x - y| \leq C_2 \delta,$$

where

$$C_2 = \frac{C_0 L + \sqrt{(C_0 L)^2 + 4C_0(C_0 + L)}}{2}.$$

We note from (2.12) that

$$(2.14) \quad |D_x\psi(x, y) + D_y\psi(x, y)| \leq C_3 \delta^2,$$

where  $C_3 := C_0 C_1 C_2^2$ . By Lemma 2.6, we get

$$(2.15) \quad \gamma(x) \cdot D_y\psi(x, y) = -e_n \cdot \gamma(x) e_n \cdot (x - y).$$

Also, we get

$$(2.16) \quad |D_y\psi(x, y)| \leq C_0 |x - y| \leq C_4 \delta,$$

where  $C_4 := C_0 C_2$ .

With  $x$  and  $y$  fixed as above, we show that if  $\delta > 0$  is sufficiently small, then

$$(2.17) \quad G(x, p) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for } p \in D^+ v^\delta(x).$$

We choose a constant  $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$  so that  $C_2\delta_1 < r/2$  and assume in what follows that  $0 < \delta < \delta_1$ . By (2.13), we have  $|x - y| < r/2$ . Hence, we have  $y \in B_r$ .

Fix any  $p \in D^+v(x)$  and choose a function  $\phi \in C^1(B_r \cap \{e_n \leq 0\})$  so that  $v - \phi$  attains a maximum at  $x$ .

We separate the argument into two cases. We first argue the case when  $e_n \cdot y < 0$ . By a simple calculus, we have

$$\frac{1}{\delta}D_y\psi(x, y) \in D^+v(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\delta}D_x\psi(x, y) + D\phi(x) = 0.$$

Hence, by assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq G\left(y, \frac{1}{\delta}D_y\psi(x, y)\right) \geq G(x, p) - \omega_G(|x - y|) - \omega_G\left(\frac{1}{\delta}|D_x\psi(x, y) + D\phi(x)|\right) \\ &\geq G(x, p) - \omega_G(C_2\delta) - \omega_G(C_3\delta). \end{aligned}$$

We choose a constant  $\delta_2 \in (0, 1)$  so that  $\omega_G(C_2\delta_2) + \omega_G(C_3\delta_2) < \varepsilon$ . Then, assuming that  $0 < \delta < \delta_1 \wedge \delta_2$ , we have  $G(x, p) \leq \varepsilon$ .

Next, we turn to the case where  $e_n \cdot y = 0$ . Then we have

$$D\phi(x) = -\frac{1}{\delta}D_x\psi(x, y) \in D^+v^\delta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\delta}D_y\psi(x, y) \in D_{B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}}^+v(y).$$

Using (2.15), we compute

$$\gamma(x) \cdot D_y\psi(x, y) = -e_n \cdot \gamma(x) \quad e_n \cdot (x - y) = -e_n \cdot \gamma(x) \quad e_n \cdot x > -C_5\delta^2,$$

where  $C_5 > 0$  is a bound of  $\sup_{B_r} |\gamma|$ . Since  $|D_y\psi(x, y)|/\delta \leq C_4$  by (2.16), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(y) \cdot \frac{1}{\delta}D_y\psi(x, y) &= \gamma(x) \cdot \frac{1}{\delta}D_y\psi(x, y) + (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)) \cdot \frac{1}{\delta}D_y\psi(x, y) \\ &> -C_5\delta - C_4\omega_\gamma(|x - y|) \geq -C_5\delta - C_4\omega_\gamma(C_2\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\omega_\gamma$  denotes the modulus of continuity of  $\gamma$ . We select a  $\delta_3 > 0$  so that  $C_4\omega_\gamma(C_2\delta_3) + C_5\delta_3 < \varepsilon$ , and assume that  $0 < \delta < \delta_1 \wedge \delta_3$ . Then we have  $\gamma(y) \cdot D_y\psi^\delta(x, y)/\delta > -\varepsilon$ . Since  $v$  is a viscosity subsolution of (2.11), we get  $G(y, D_y\psi(x, y)/\delta) \leq 0$ . Now, as in the previous case, we obtain

$$0 \geq G(x, D\phi(x)) - \omega_G(C_2\delta) - \omega_G(C_3\delta).$$

Consequently, if  $0 < \delta < \delta_1 \wedge \delta_2 \wedge \delta_3$ , then we have  $G(x, p) \leq \varepsilon$ . That is, in both cases, inequality (2.17) holds if  $0 < \delta < \delta_1 \wedge \delta_2 \wedge \delta_3$ .

Now, we assume in addition that  $|e_n \cdot x| < \delta^2$  and show that if  $\delta > 0$  is sufficiently small, then

$$(2.18) \quad \gamma(x) \cdot p \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for } p \in D^+v^\delta(x).$$

We fix any  $p \in D^+v(x)$  and choose a function  $\phi \in C^1(\bar{B}_r)$  so that  $v^\delta - \phi$  attains a maximum at  $x$  and  $D\phi(x) = p$ . For sufficiently small  $t > 0$ , we have  $y - t\gamma(x) \in B_r$  and hence

$$v^\delta(x - t\gamma(x)) \geq v(y) - \frac{1}{\delta}\psi(x - t\gamma(x), y).$$

Thus, for sufficiently small  $t > 0$ , we have

$$\phi(x) - \phi(x - t\gamma(x)) \leq v^\delta(x) - v^\delta(x - t\gamma(x)) \leq -\frac{1}{\delta}(\psi(x, y) - \psi(x - t\gamma(x), y)),$$

which readily yields

$$\gamma(x) \cdot D\phi(x) \leq -\gamma(x) \cdot \frac{1}{\delta} D_x \psi(x, y).$$

Noting that  $e_n \cdot y \leq 0$  and  $|e_n \cdot x| < \delta^2$ , we observe by (2.15) that

$$\gamma(x) \cdot D_y \psi(x, y) \leq -e_n \cdot \gamma(x) \cdot e_n \cdot x < C_5 \delta^2.$$

Using these observations together with (2.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(x) \cdot p &\leq -\gamma(x) \cdot \frac{1}{\delta} D_x \psi(x, y) \\ &\leq \gamma(x) \cdot \frac{1}{\delta} D_y \psi(x, y) + \frac{|\gamma(x)|}{\delta} |D_x \psi(x, y) + D_y \psi(x, y)| \leq (C_5 + C_3 C_5) \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing a constant  $\delta_4 > 0$  so that  $C_5(1 + C_3)\delta_4 < \varepsilon$ , we find that if  $0 < \delta < \delta_4$ , then (2.18) holds.

Finally, we may choose a constant  $\delta_5 > 0$  so that  $|v(x) - v^\delta(x)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $x \in B_{r/2} \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$  and  $0 < \delta < \delta_5$ . Fixing a constant  $0 < \delta < \min_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \delta_i$  and setting  $w = v^\delta$ , we see that  $w$  satisfies the required properties with  $\delta^2$  in place of  $\delta$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* It is enough to show that for each  $\tau \in I$  there is a function  $p_\tau \in L^\infty(I_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$  for some constant  $\delta = \delta_\tau > 0$ , where  $I_\tau := I \cap [\tau - \delta, \tau + \delta]$ , such that (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3) hold with  $I_\tau$  in place of  $I$ .

We fix any  $\tau \in I$ . If  $\eta(\tau) \in \Omega$ , then there is a constant  $\delta > 0$  such that for  $t \in I_\tau := I \cap [\tau - \delta, \tau + \delta]$ , we have  $\eta(t) \in \Omega$ . Lemma 2.2 then guarantees that there is a function  $p_\tau \in L^\infty(I_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$  such that (2.1)–(2.3) hold with  $I_\tau$  and  $p_\tau$  in place of  $I$  and  $p$ , respectively.

We may therefore assume that  $\eta(\tau) \in \partial\Omega$ . By making a  $C^1$  change of variables, we may assume that  $\eta(\tau) = 0$  and that there is a constant  $r > 0$  such that  $B_r \cap \Omega \subset \{e_n^* < 0\}$  and  $\overline{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* < 0\} \subset \Omega$ .

We choose a constant  $\delta > 0$  so that  $\eta(t) \in B_{r/2}$  for all  $t \in I_\tau := [\tau - \delta, \tau + \delta] \cap I$ . We choose a constant  $L > 0$  so that  $\{H(x, \cdot) \leq 0\} \subset \overline{B}_L$  for  $x \in \Omega$ . An immediate consequence is that  $u$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\overline{\Omega}$  with  $L$  as its Lipschitz constant.

We may assume that  $\gamma$  and  $g$  are defined on  $\overline{\Omega}$  as continuous functions. We fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and choose functions  $\gamma_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\overline{B}_r, \mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $g_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\overline{B}_r, \mathbb{R})$  so that

$$|\gamma_\varepsilon(x) - \gamma(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{L} \quad \text{and} \quad |g_\varepsilon(x) - g(x)| \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } x \in B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}.$$

We may assume furthermore by replacing  $r > 0$  by a smaller one if needed that  $\gamma_\varepsilon(x) \cdot e_n > 0$  for all  $x \in \overline{B}_r$ .

We remark here that  $u$  is a subsolution of

$$(2.19) \quad \begin{cases} H(x, Du(x)) \leq 0 & \text{in } B_r \cap \{e_n^* < 0\}, \\ D_{\gamma_\varepsilon} u(x) = g_\varepsilon(x) + 2\varepsilon & \text{on } B_r \cap \{e_n^* = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

To see this, let  $x \in B_r \cap \{e_n^* = 0\}$  and  $p \in D_{B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}}^+ u(x)$ . We have two cases, either  $H(x, p) \leq 0$  or  $\gamma(x) \cdot p \leq g(x)$ . If  $H(x, p) \leq 0$ , then we are done. Otherwise, applying Lemma 2.3, with  $B_r$  replaced by a small ball centered at  $x$ , we find that

$$\gamma_\varepsilon(x) \cdot p \leq g(x) + \varepsilon \leq g_\varepsilon(x) + 2\varepsilon.$$

That is,  $u$  is a subsolution of (2.19).

Thanks to Lemma 2.4, there is a function  $\psi_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\overline{B}_r)$  such that

$$(2.20) \quad \gamma_\varepsilon(x) \cdot D\psi_\varepsilon(x) = g_\varepsilon(x) + 3\varepsilon \quad \text{for } x \in B_r.$$

We have used here the fact that  $\gamma_\varepsilon$  and  $g_\varepsilon$  can be extended to  $C^\infty$  functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  so that  $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \gamma_\varepsilon(x) \cdot e_n > 0$  and  $\sup_{\mathbb{R}^n} (|g_\varepsilon| + |\gamma_\varepsilon|) < \infty$ .

We may assume by extending  $H$  to  $\overline{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* > 0\}$  in an appropriate manner that  $H$  is defined and continuous at least on  $\overline{B}_r \times \mathbb{R}^n$  and satisfies (A2), with  $B_r$  in place of  $\Omega$ . We set  $v_\varepsilon := u - \psi_\varepsilon$  on  $\overline{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$  and  $G_\varepsilon(x, p) = H(x, p + D\psi_\varepsilon(x))$  for  $(x, p) \in (\overline{B}_r \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ . It is obvious that  $v_\varepsilon$  is a subsolution of  $G_\varepsilon(x, Dv_\varepsilon(x)) = 0$  in  $B_r \cap \{e_n^* < 0\}$ . Moreover, it is easily checked that  $v_\varepsilon$  is a subsolution of

$$\begin{cases} G_\varepsilon(x, Dv_\varepsilon(x)) \leq 0 & \text{in } B_r \cap \{e_n^* < 0\}, \\ D_{\gamma_\varepsilon} v_\varepsilon(x) = -\varepsilon & \text{on } B_r \cap \{e_n^* = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

According to Lemma 2.5, there exists a function  $\phi_\varepsilon \in C(\overline{B}_{r/2} \cap \{e_n^* \leq \rho_\varepsilon\})$ , with  $\rho_\varepsilon > 0$ , such that

$$|v_\varepsilon(x) - \phi_\varepsilon(x)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } x \in B_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\},$$

and  $\phi_\varepsilon$  is both a subsolution of

$$(2.21) \quad G_\varepsilon(x, D\phi_\varepsilon(x)) = \varepsilon \quad \text{in } B_{r/2} \cap \{e_n^* < \rho_\varepsilon\},$$

and of

$$(2.22) \quad \gamma_\varepsilon(x) \cdot D\phi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon \quad \text{on } B_{r/2} \cap \{|e_n^*| < \rho_\varepsilon\}.$$

Now, according to Lemma 2.2, there is a function  $q_\varepsilon \in L^\infty(I_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $q_\varepsilon(t) \in \partial_C \phi_\varepsilon(\eta(t))$  and  $(d\phi_\varepsilon \circ \eta / dt)(t) = q_\varepsilon(t) \cdot \dot{\eta}(t)$  for a.e.  $t \in I_\tau$ . The last equality can be stated as

$$(2.23) \quad \phi_\varepsilon(\eta(t)) - \phi_\varepsilon(\eta(\tau)) = \int_\tau^t q_\varepsilon(s) \cdot \dot{\eta}(s) \, ds \quad \text{for } t \in I_\tau.$$

Setting

$$I_{\tau, \partial} = \{t \in I_\tau : e_n \cdot \eta(t) = 0\}.$$

and noting that  $\eta(t) \in B_{r/2} \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$  for  $t \in I_\tau$ , from (2.21) and (2.22) we get

$$(2.24) \quad G_\varepsilon(\eta(t), q_\varepsilon(t)) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in I_\tau,$$

$$(2.25) \quad \gamma_\varepsilon(\eta(t)) \cdot q_\varepsilon(t) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in I_{\tau, \partial}.$$

We set  $p_\varepsilon(t) = q_\varepsilon(t) + D\psi_\varepsilon(\eta(t))$  for  $t \in I_\tau$ . Then (2.23), (2.24) and (2.25) read

$$(2.26) \quad \phi_\varepsilon(\eta(t)) - \phi_\varepsilon(\eta(\tau)) = \int_\tau^t (p_\varepsilon(s) - D\psi_\varepsilon(s)) \cdot \dot{\eta}(s) \, ds \quad \text{for } t \in I_\tau.$$

$$(2.27) \quad H(\eta(t), p_\varepsilon(t)) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in I_\tau,$$

$$(2.28) \quad \gamma_\varepsilon(\eta(t)) \cdot (p_\varepsilon(t) - D\psi_\varepsilon(\eta(t))) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in I_{\tau, \partial}.$$

Combining this (2.28) and (2.20), we get

$$\gamma_\varepsilon(\eta(t)) \cdot p_\varepsilon(t) \leq g_\varepsilon(\eta(t)) + 4\varepsilon \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in I_{\tau, \partial}.$$

By (2.26), we have

$$(\phi_\varepsilon + \psi_\varepsilon)(t) = (\phi_\varepsilon + \psi_\varepsilon)(\tau) + \int_\tau^t p_\varepsilon(s) \cdot \dot{\eta}(s) \, ds \quad \text{for } t \in I_\tau.$$

We note here that  $\phi_\varepsilon + \psi_\varepsilon \rightarrow u$  uniformly on  $\bar{B}_r \cap \{e_n^* \leq 0\}$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . From (2.27), we find that

$$|p_\varepsilon(t)| \leq L \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in I_\tau.$$

Hence, there is a sequence  $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0+$  such that the sequence  $\{p_{\varepsilon_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to some function  $p$  on  $I_\tau$  weakly-star in  $L^\infty(I_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$ . It is a standard observation that there is a sequence  $\{\pi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^\infty(I_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $\pi_j(t)$  converges to  $p(t)$  for a.e.  $t \in I_\tau$  and for each  $j$ , the function  $\pi_j$  is a convex combination of  $\{p_{\varepsilon_k}\}_{k \geq j}$ . Thus, sending  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} u(\eta(t)) - u(\eta(\tau)) &= \int_\tau^t p(s) \cdot \dot{\eta}(s) \, ds \quad \text{for } t \in I_\tau, \\ H(\eta(t), p(t)) &\leq 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in I_\tau, \\ \gamma(\eta(t)) \cdot p(t) &\leq g(\eta(t)) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in I_{\tau, \partial}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete.  $\square$

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

We start by recalling some results established in [15] and needed in this section.

We write  $J = [0, \infty)$  for simplicity of notation. The Skorokhod problem associated with  $(\Omega, \gamma)$  is to find a pair  $(\eta, l) \in \text{Lip}(J, \mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(J, \mathbb{R})$ , for given  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$  and  $v \in L^\infty(J, \mathbb{R}^n)$ , such that

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \eta(0) = x, & \eta(s) \in \bar{\Omega} \quad \text{for all } s \in J, \\ l(s) \geq 0 & \text{for a.e. } s \in J, \\ l(s) = 0 & \text{for a.e. } s \in J \text{ such that } \eta(s) \in \Omega, \\ \dot{\eta}(s) + l(s)\gamma(\eta(s)) = v(s) & \text{for a.e. } s \in J. \end{cases}$$

According to [15, Theorem 4.2], problem (3.1) has a solution. For  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ , we denote by  $\text{SP}(x)$  the set of all triples

$$(\eta, v, l) \in \text{Lip}(J, \mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(J, \mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(J, \mathbb{R})$$

which satisfy (3.1).

Let  $L$  denote the Lagrangian of  $H$ . That is,  $L(x, \xi) = \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\xi \cdot p - H(x, p)\}$  for  $(x, \xi) \in \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . Thanks to [15, Theorem 5.1], we know that if  $u$  is a solution of (1.1)–(1.3), then

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= \inf \left\{ \int_0^t (L(\eta(s), -v(s)) + g(\eta(s))l(s)) \, ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + u_0(\eta(t)) : (\eta, v, l) \in \text{SP}(x) \right\} \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

The dynamic programming principle yields for  $(x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)$  and  $0 < \tau < t$ ,

$$u(x, t) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^\tau (L(\eta(s), -v(s)) + g(\eta(s))l(s)) \, ds + u(\eta(\tau), t - \tau) : (\eta, v, l) \in \text{SP}(x) \right\}.$$

We assume throughout this section that  $c = 0$ , i.e., problem (1.5) has a solution. In what follows,  $u = u(x, t)$  will denote the unique solution of (1.1)–(1.3). Due to [15, Lemma 6.5], if we set

$$u_\infty(x) = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(x, t) \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega},$$

then  $u_\infty \in \text{Lip}(\bar{\Omega})$  and  $u_\infty$  is a solution of (1.5). Moreover, the proof of [15, Lemma 6.5] shows that the convergence

$$(3.2) \quad u_\infty(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \inf \{u(y, t) : t > r\}.$$

is uniform for  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ .

Due to [15, Theorem 7.3], if  $\phi$  is a solution of (1.5), then for each  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$  there exists a triple  $(\eta, v, l) \in \text{SP}(x)$  such that

$$\phi(x) - \phi(\eta(t)) = \int_0^t (L(\eta(s), -v(s)) + l(s)g(\eta(s))) \, ds \quad \text{for } t > 0.$$

According to [13, Lemma 4.4] or [8, Lemma 5.2], if, in addition to (A1) and (A2), (A5)<sub>+</sub> (resp., (A5)<sub>−</sub>) is satisfied, then there is a constant  $\delta_1 > 0$  such that for any  $\delta \in [0, \delta_1]$  and  $(x, \xi) \in S$ ,

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} L(x, (1 + \delta)\xi) &\leq (1 + \delta)L(x, \xi) + \delta\omega_1(\delta), \\ (\text{resp., } L(x, (1 - \delta)\xi) &\leq (1 - \delta)L(x, \xi) + \delta\omega_1(\delta)). \end{aligned}$$

(The definition of  $S$  is given in Section 1 as well as that of  $Q$ .)

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* It is enough to show that

$$(3.4) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (u(x, t) - u_\infty(x))_+ = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \bar{\Omega}$$

and the convergence is uniform for  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ . In fact, it is immediate to see from this uniform convergence and (3.2) that  $u(x, t) \rightarrow u_\infty(x)$  uniformly for  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

Fix any  $z \in \bar{\Omega}$ . Let  $(\eta, v, l) \in \text{SP}(z)$  be such that for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$u_\infty(z) - u_\infty(\eta(t)) = \int_0^t (L(\eta(s), -v(s)) + l(s)g(\eta(s))) \, ds$$

Due to Theorem 2.1, there exists a function  $q \in L^\infty(J, \mathbb{R}^n)$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{ds} u_\infty(\eta(s)) = q(s) \cdot \dot{\eta}(s) & \text{for a.e. } s \in J, \\ H(\eta(s), q(s)) \leq 0 & \text{for a.e. } s \in J, \\ \gamma(\eta) \cdot q(s) \leq g(\eta(s)) & \text{for a.e. } s \in J_\partial, \end{cases}$$

where  $J_\partial := \{s \in J : \eta(s) \in \partial\Omega\}$ .

We now show that

$$(3.5) \quad H(\eta(s), q(s)) = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in J,$$

$$(3.6) \quad \gamma(\eta(s)) \cdot q(s) = g(\eta(s)) \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in J_\partial,$$

$$(3.7) \quad -q(s) \cdot v(s) = H(\eta(s), q(s)) + L(\eta(s), -v(s)) \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in J.$$

We remark here that equality (3.7) is equivalent to saying that

$$-v(s) \in D_2^- H(\eta(s), q(s)) \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in J,$$

or

$$q(s) \in D_2^- L(\eta(s), -v(s)) \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in J,$$

where  $D_2^- f(x, y)$  stands for the subdifferential with respect to the second variable  $y$  of the function  $f$  on a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  at  $(x, y)$ .

Fix any  $t > 0$ . Noting that

$$u_\infty(\eta(t)) - u_\infty(\eta(0)) = \int_0^t q(s) \cdot \dot{\eta}(s) \, ds,$$

we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t (L(\eta(s), -v(s)) + l(s)g(\eta(s))) \, ds \\ &= u_\infty(z) - u_\infty(\eta(t)) = - \int_0^t q(s) \cdot \dot{\eta}(s) \, ds \\ &= \int_0^t q(s) \cdot (l(s)\gamma(\eta(s)) - v(s)) \, ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t (H(\eta(s), q(s)) + L(\eta(s), -v(s)) + l(s)g(\eta(s))) \, ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t (L(\eta(s), -v(s)) + l(s)g(\eta(s))) \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

This series of inequalities ensures that (3.5)–(3.7) hold.

We fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and prove that there is a constant  $\tau > 0$  and for each  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$  a number  $\sigma(x) \in [0, \tau]$  for which

$$(3.8) \quad u_\infty(x) + \varepsilon > u(x, \sigma(x)).$$

In view of the definition of  $u_\infty$ , for each  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$  there is a constant  $t(x) > 0$  such that

$$u_\infty(x) + \varepsilon > u(x, t(x)).$$

By continuity, for each fixed  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ , we can choose a constant  $r(x) > 0$  so that

$$u_\infty(y) + \varepsilon > u(y, t(x)) \quad \text{for } y \in \bar{\Omega} \cap B_{r(x)}(x),$$

where  $B_\rho(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |y - x| < \rho\}$ . By compactness, there is a finite sequence  $x_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , such that

$$\bar{\Omega} \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} B_{r(x_i)}(x_i),$$

That is, for any  $y \in \bar{\Omega}$  there exists  $x_i$ , with  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , such that  $y \in B_{r(x_i)}(x_i)$ , which implies

$$u_\infty(y) + \varepsilon > u(y, t(x_i)).$$

Thus, setting

$$\tau = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} t(x_i),$$

we find that for each  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$  there is a constant  $\sigma(x) \in [0, \tau]$  such that (3.8) holds.

The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of [13, Theorem 4.3], but for completeness we give here the details.

In what follows we fix  $\tau > 0$  and  $\sigma(x) \in [0, \tau]$ , with  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ , so that (3.8) holds. Also, we fix a constant  $\delta_1 > 0$  and a modulus  $\omega_1$  so that (3.3) holds.

We divide our argument into two cases according to which hypothesis is valid, (A5)<sub>+</sub> or (A5)<sub>-</sub>. We first argue under hypothesis (A5)<sub>+</sub>. Choose a constant  $T > \tau$  so that  $\tau/(T - \tau) \leq \delta_1$ . Fix any  $t \geq T$ , and set  $\theta = \sigma(\eta(t)) \in [0, \tau]$ . We set  $\delta = \theta/(t - \theta)$  and note that  $\delta \leq \tau/(t - \tau) \leq \delta_1$ . We define functions  $\eta_\delta, v_\delta, l_\delta$  on  $J$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\delta(s) &= \eta((1 + \delta)s), \\ v_\delta(s) &= (1 + \delta)v((1 + \delta)s), \\ l_\delta(s) &= (1 + \delta)l((1 + \delta)s), \end{aligned}$$

and note that  $(\eta_\delta, v_\delta, l_\delta) \in \text{SP}(z)$ . By (3.5) and (3.7), we know that  $(\eta(s), q(s)) \in Q$  and  $(\eta(s), -v(s)) \in S$  for a.e.  $s \in J$ . Therefore, by (3.3), we get

$$L(\eta_\delta(s), -v_\delta(s)) \leq (1 + \delta)L(\eta((1 + \delta)s), -v((1 + \delta)s)) + \delta\omega_1(\delta) \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in J.$$

Integrating this over  $(0, t - \theta)$ , making a change of variables in the integral and noting that  $(1 + \delta)(t - \theta) = t$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{t-\theta} L(\eta_\delta(s), -v_\delta(s)) \, ds &\leq \int_0^t L(\eta(s), -v(s)) \, ds + (t - \theta)\delta\omega_1(\delta) \\ &= \int_0^t L(\eta(s), -v(s)) \, ds + \theta\omega_1(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\int_0^{t-\theta} l_\delta(s)g(\eta_\delta(s)) \, ds = \int_0^t l(s)g(\eta(s)) \, ds.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} u(z, t) &\leq \int_0^{t-\theta} (L(\eta_\delta(s), v_\delta(s)) + l_\delta(s)g(\eta_\delta(s))) \, ds + u(\eta_\delta(t - \theta), \theta) \\ &\leq \int_0^t (L(\eta(s), -v(s)) + l(s)g(\eta(s))) \, ds + \theta\omega_1(\delta) + u(\eta_\delta(t - \theta), \theta) \\ &= u_\infty(z) - u_\infty(\eta(t)) + \tau\omega_1(\delta) + u(\eta(t), \sigma(\eta(t))) \\ &< u_\infty(z) - u_\infty(\eta(t)) + \tau\omega_1(\delta) + u_\infty(\eta(t)) + \varepsilon \\ &= u_\infty(z) + \tau\omega_1(\delta) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, recalling that  $\delta \leq \tau/(t - \tau)$ , we get

$$(3.9) \quad u(z, t) \leq u_\infty(z) + \tau\omega_1\left(\frac{\tau}{t - \tau}\right) + \varepsilon.$$

Next, we consider the case where (A5)<sub>-</sub> is satisfied. We choose  $T > \tau$  as before, and fix  $t \geq T$ . Set  $\theta = \sigma(\eta(t - \tau)) \in [0, \tau]$  and  $\delta = (\tau - \theta)/(t - \theta)$ . Observe that  $(1 - \delta)(t - \theta) = t - \tau$  and  $\delta \leq \tau/(t - \tau) \leq \delta_1$ .

We set  $\eta_\delta(s) = \eta((1 - \delta)s)$ ,  $v_\delta(s) = (1 - \delta)v((1 - \delta)s)$  and  $l_\delta(s) = (1 - \delta)l((1 - \delta)s)$  for  $s \in J$  and observe that  $(\eta_\delta, v_\delta, l_\delta) \in \text{SP}(z)$ . As before, thanks to (3.3), we get

$$L(\eta_\delta(s), -v_\delta(s)) \leq (1 - \delta)L(\eta((1 - \delta)s), -v((1 - \delta)s)) + \delta\omega_1(\delta) \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in J.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{t-\theta} L(\eta_\delta(s), -v_\delta(s)) \, ds &\leq \int_0^{t-\tau} L(\eta(s), -v(s)) \, ds + (t - \theta)\delta\omega_1(\delta) \\ &= \int_0^{t-\tau} L(\eta(s), -v(s)) \, ds + (\tau - \theta)\omega_1(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_0^{t-\theta} l_\delta(s)g(\eta_\delta(s)) \, ds = \int_0^{t-\tau} l(s)g(\eta(s)) \, ds.$$

Moreover, we get

$$\begin{aligned} u(z, t) &\leq \int_0^{t-\theta} (L(\eta_\delta(s), v_\delta(s)) + l_\delta(s)g(\eta_\delta(s))) \, ds + u(\eta_\delta(t - \theta), \theta) \\ &\leq \int_0^{t-\tau} (L(\eta(s), -v(s)) + l(s)g(\eta(s))) \, ds + (\tau - \theta)\omega_1(\delta) + u(\eta(t - \tau), \theta) \\ &= u_\infty(z) - u_\infty(\eta(t - \tau)) + (\tau - \theta)\omega_1(\delta) + u(\eta(t - \tau), \sigma(\eta(t - \tau))) \\ &< u_\infty(z) - u_\infty(\eta(t - \tau)) + (\tau - \theta)\omega_1(\delta) + u_\infty(\eta(t - \tau)) + \varepsilon \\ &= u_\infty(z) + \tau\omega_1(\delta) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$u(z, t) \leq u_\infty(z) + \tau\omega_1\left(\frac{\tau}{t - \tau}\right) + \varepsilon,$$

From the above inequality and (3.9) we see that if  $t \geq T$ , then

$$u(x, t) \leq u_\infty(x) + \tau\omega_1\left(\frac{\tau}{t - \tau}\right) + \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } x \in \bar{\Omega},$$

which shows that (3.4) is valid. The proof is now complete.  $\square$

## 4. REMARK ON ASYMPTOTIC SOLUTIONS

We continue to assume that the critical value  $c$  is zero. Let  $u$  denote the unique solution of (1.1)–(1.3). We set

$$\begin{aligned} u_0^-(x) &= \sup \{ \psi(x) : \psi \text{ is a subsolution of (1.5), } \psi \leq u_0 \text{ on } \bar{\Omega} \} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u_d^-(x) &= \inf \{ d(x, y) + u_0(y) : y \in \bar{\Omega} \} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u^-(x, t) &= \inf \{ u(x, t + \tau) : \tau > 0 \} \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty), \\ u_0^\infty(x) &= \inf \{ \phi(x) : \phi \text{ is a solution of (1.5), } \phi \geq u_0^- \text{ on } \bar{\Omega} \} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u_d^\infty(x) &= \inf \{ d(x, y) + u_d^-(y) : y \in \mathcal{A} \} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u_\infty(x) &= \sup \{ u^-(x, t) : t > 0 \} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $d$  denotes the function on  $\bar{\Omega} \times \bar{\Omega}$  given by

$$d(x, y) = \sup \{ \psi(x) - \psi(y) : \psi \text{ is a subsolution of (1.5)} \},$$

and  $\mathcal{A}$  denotes the Aubry (or Aubry-Mather) set associated with (1.5). See [15] for the definition of the Aubry set associated with (1.5).

Note here that the proof of Theorem 1.3 shows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(x, t) = u_\infty(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

The following proposition gives two other formulas for  $u_\infty$ , which are valid without one of assumptions (A5)<sub>+</sub> or (A5)<sub>-</sub>.

**Proposition 4.1.** *For every  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$  we have*

$$(4.1) \quad u_0^-(x) = u_d^-(x) = u^-(x, 0),$$

$$(4.2) \quad u_0^\infty(x) = u_d^\infty(x) = u_\infty(x).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\psi$  be a subsolution of (1.5) satisfying  $\psi \leq u_0$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Then we have

$$\psi(x) \leq \psi(y) + d(x, y) \leq u_0(y) + d(x, y) \quad \text{for } x, y \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Hence, we see that  $u_0^- \leq u_d^-$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Next, since  $u_d^- \leq u_0$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ , observing by [15, Theorem 2.7] that  $u_d^-$  is a subsolution of (1.5), we find that  $u_d^- \leq u_0^-$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Thus we have  $u_0^- = u_d^-$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Now, since  $u_0^- \leq u_0$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$  and  $u_0^-(x)$ , as a function of  $(x, t)$ , is a subsolution of (1.1)–(1.3), by comparison (see for instance [15, Theorem 3.4]) we find that  $u_0^-(x) \leq u(x, t)$  for  $(x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)$ . From this it follows that  $u_0^- \leq u^-(\cdot, 0)$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . On the other hand,  $u^-(x, t)$  is a solution of (1.1) and (1.2) and nondecreasing in  $t$ , and consequently  $u^-(\cdot, 0)$  is a subsolution of (1.5). Moreover, we have  $u^-(\cdot, 0) \leq u_0$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ , and conclude that  $u^-(\cdot, 0) \leq u_0^-$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . We thus find that  $u_d^- = u_0^- = u^-(\cdot, 0)$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ .

Next let  $\phi$  be a solution of (1.5) satisfying  $\phi \geq u_0^- = u_d^-$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . By [15, Theorem 6.8], we have

$$\phi(x) = \inf \{ \phi(y) + d(x, y) : y \in \mathcal{A} \} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega},$$

and hence

$$\phi(x) \geq \inf \{ u_d^-(y) + d(x, y) : y \in \mathcal{A} \} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Accordingly, we get  $u_0^\infty \geq u_d^\infty$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Next, if we set  $\phi(x) = u_d^-(y) + d(x, y)$  for any fixed  $y \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $\phi$  is a solution of (1.5) and  $\phi(x) \geq u_d^-(x) = u_0^-(x)$  for  $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ . Hence we get

$u_0^\infty \leq u_d^\infty$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Thus we have  $u_0^\infty = u_d^\infty$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Now we note that  $u_0^\infty \geq u^-(\cdot, 0)$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Since  $u_0^\infty(x)$  and  $u^-(x, t)$ , as functions of  $(x, t)$ , are solutions of (1.1) and (1.2), we see by comparison that  $u_0^\infty(x) \geq u^-(x, t)$  for  $(x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)$ , from which follows that  $u_0^\infty \geq u_\infty$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Similarly, we have  $u_0^-(x) \leq u^-(x, t)$  for  $(x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)$ . Hence we get  $u_0^- \leq u_\infty$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Since  $u_\infty$  is a solution of (1.5), we see that  $u_0^\infty \leq u_\infty$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . We thus conclude that  $u_d^\infty = u_0^\infty = u_\infty$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ .  $\square$

The interpretation of the above proposition into the general case of  $c$  is straightforward, and indeed, we just need to replace the solution  $u(x, t)$  of (1.1)–(1.3) and  $H(x, p)$ , respectively, by  $\tilde{u}(x, t) := u(x, t) + ct$  and  $\tilde{H}(x, p) = H(x, p) - c$  in the above argument. The conclusion is as follows. We set

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, y) &= \sup\{\psi(x) - \psi(y) : \psi \text{ is a subsolution of (1.4)}\} \quad \text{for } x, y \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u_0^-(x) &= \sup\{\psi(x) : \psi \text{ is a subsolution of (1.4), } \psi \leq u_0 \text{ on } \bar{\Omega}\} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u_d^-(x) &= \inf\{d(x, y) + u_0(y) : y \in \bar{\Omega}\} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u^-(x, t) &= \inf\{u(x, t + \tau) + c(t + \tau) : \tau > 0\} \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty), \\ u_0^\infty(x) &= \inf\{\phi(x) : \phi \text{ is a solution of (1.4), } \phi \geq u_0^- \text{ on } \bar{\Omega}\} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u_d^\infty(x) &= \inf\{d(x, y) + u_d^-(y) : y \in \mathcal{A}\} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u_\infty(x) &= \sup\{u^-(x, t) : t > 0\} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  denotes the Aubry set associated with (1.4). Then the assertion of Theorem 1.3 together with Proposition 4.1 is stated as

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (u(x, t) + ct) = u_\infty(x) = u_d^\infty(x) = u_0^\infty(x) \quad \text{uniformly on } \bar{\Omega}.$$

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Bardi and I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta. *Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. With appendices by Maurizio Falcone and Pierpaolo Soravia*. Birkhäuser Inc., Boston, MA, 1997.
- [2] G. Barles. Asymptotic behavior of viscosity solutions of first Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Ric. Mat.*, 34(2):227–260, 1985.
- [3] G. Barles. *Solutions de viscosité des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi*. Mathématiques & Applications. Springer-Verlag, Paris, 1994.
- [4] G. Barles and H. Mitake. *personal communication*, 2010.
- [5] G. Barles and J.-M. Roquejoffre. Ergodic type problems and large time behaviour of unbounded solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 31(7-9):1209–1225, 2006.
- [6] G. Brales and P. E. Souganidis. On the large time behavior of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 31(4):925–939, 2000.
- [7] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P.-L. Lions. User’s guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 27(1):1–67, 1992.
- [8] A. Davini and A. Siconolfi. A generalized dynamical approach to the large time behavior of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 38(2):478–502, 2006.
- [9] A. Fathi. Sur la convergence du semi-groupe de Lax-Oleinik. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 327(3):267–270, 1998.
- [10] Y. Fujita, H. Ishii, and P. Loreti. Asymptotic solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Euclidean  $n$  space. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 55(5):1671–1700, 2006.

- [11] N. Ichihara and H. Ishii. Asymptotic solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with semi-periodic Hamiltonians. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 33(4-6):784–807, 2008.
- [12] N. Ichihara and H. Ishii. The large-time behavior of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations on the real line. *Methods Appl. Anal.*, 15(2):223–242, 2008.
- [13] N. Ichihara and H. Ishii. Long-time behavior of solutions of Hamilton–Jacobi equations with convex and coercive Hamiltonians. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 194(2):383–419, 2009.
- [14] H. Ishii. Asymptotic solutions for large time of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Euclidean  $n$  space. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 25(2):231–266, 2008.
- [15] H. Ishii. Weak KAM aspects of convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations with Neumann type boundary conditions. *preprint*, 2010.
- [16] S. N. Kruzkov. Generalized solutions of nonlinear equations of the first order with several independent variables. II (in Russian). *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 72(114):108–134, 1967.
- [17] P.-L. Lions. *Generalized solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, volume 69 of *Research Notes in Mathematics*. Pitman, London, 1982.
- [18] P.-L. Lions. Neumann type boundary conditions for Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 52(4):793–820, 4 19985.
- [19] H. Mitake. Asymptotic solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with state constraints. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 58(3):393–410, 2008.
- [20] H. Mitake. The large-time behavior of solutions of the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem for hamilton-jacobi equations. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 15(3):347–362, 2008.
- [21] G. Namah and J.-M. Roquejoffre. Remarks on the long time behaviour of the solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 24(5-6):883–893, 1997.
- [22] J.-M. Roquejoffre. Convergence to steady states or periodic solutions in a class of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 80(1):85–104, 2001.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WASEDA UNIVERSITY, NISHI-WASEDA, SHINJUKU, TOKYO, 169-8050  
JAPAN

*E-mail address*: hitoshi.ishii@waseda.jp